





✓ = To be included in quantitative and qualitative evaluation

MTC Regional Means-Based Transit Fare Pricing Study Preliminary Scenarios – Feedback from Stakeholders

This attachment summarizes the feedback that we received from each of the stakeholder groups, including each group’s overall ratings of the scenarios (high, medium, low), and commonly heard comments about each scenario.

	1. The Big Idea <i>Suggestions from individual stakeholders*</i>	2. Discounted low Income fares and/or pass program ✓	3. Discounted off-peak fare ✓ (in combination with ‘C’ below)	4. <i>Regional (or subregional) interagency pass</i>	5. Make transfers more affordable	6. Monthly fare or trip accumulators ✓	7. Add cash to Clipper card for low income riders; no change to fares ✓	8. Increase use of existing discounts
Study Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) <i>Vote for <u>any</u> you’d like to further evaluate (most vocal supporters noted)</i>	#4 & #6	High SFMTA VTA	Medium Marin Transit VTA (support conditioned on further evaluation)	Low BART (“BART Board is interested in connectivity”)	Low	High	Medium Social Services TAC members Equity TAC members VTA	Low
Partnership Transit Finance Working Group (TFWG) <i>General feedback (VTA’s TFWG votes have been incorporated in TAC section above)</i>	N/A (no suggestions)	N/A (no comments; several operators commented at TAC)	N/A (no comments; several operators commented at TAC)	N/A (no comments; several operators commented at TAC)	N/A (no comments; several operators commented at TAC)	N/A (no comments; several operators commented at TAC)	Low	N/A (no comments; several operators commented at TAC)
Policy Advisory Council Equity & Access (E&A) Subcommittee <i>General feedback</i>	#4 & #2 #4 & #6	Low	Low	High	Low	High	Medium	Low
San Jose Focus Group with Low-Income Persons <i>Vote for top two choices</i>	N/A (not discussed)	Low	Low	Very High	Medium	Low	Medium	N/A (not discussed)
Vallejo Focus Group with Low-Income Persons <i>Vote for top two choices</i>	N/A (not discussed)	High	Low	High	High**	Medium	Medium	N/A (not discussed)
SF/Oakland Phone Interviews with Low-Income Persons <i>Vote for top two choices</i>	#2 & #7	High	High	High	Low	Medium	Medium	N/A (not discussed)

	1. The Big Idea <i>Suggestions from individual stakeholders*</i>	2. Discounted low Income fares and/or pass program 	3. Discounted off-peak fare  (in combination with 'C' below)	4. <i>Regional (or subregional) interagency pass</i>	5. Make transfers more affordable	6. Monthly fare or trip accumulators 	7. Add cash to Clipper card for low income riders; no change to fares 	8. Increase use of existing discounts
Commonly heard or notable "pros"			Makes a lot of sense (E&A); It would benefit <i>me</i> personally, but voting for another option because it would help more people (focus groups)	Even if a heavy lift and/or only feasible at subregional level, we should keep it as one of the scenarios that is further evaluated because it would bring us toward our ultimate goal of better coordinated services (E&A, focus groups); Commonly requested by vets who need to make inter-county trips (focus groups)	Could potentially address needs of low-income persons who have multi-operator trips as a result of being displaced (TAC); Makes sense and is more fair because if a person is just making one trip (from origin to destination), it doesn't make sense why they should need to pay more just because they have to switch buses (focus groups)	In line with people's needs, makes sense (E&A)	Simple (TAC, E&A, focus groups); Easy to communicate to riders (TAC); Potential to partner with social services for means-testing and/or distribution (TAC)	Simple (TAC)
Commonly heard or notable "cons"		Adds yet another fare category (E&A)	If fares are raised during peak, it might hurt low-income riders (E&A); Increases complexity (E&A); Good idea, but transit would need to run later in order for this to be beneficial (Vallejo focus group)	Challenge to incorporate operators with distance-based fares (TAC); Operators would have to sacrifice revenue (TAC); Intense coordination required would be a big challenge/hard sell to operators (E&A, focus groups)	Interagency transfers are not very common (i.e., little benefit) (TAC)	Concerned about potential revenue loss for operators (E&A)	Fraud potential (TAC, TFWG)	

* We did not ask each group to come to a consensus on a "Big Idea"; the combinations shown are miscellaneous suggestions from individual group members.

** Note that this is a very specific local concern related to the fact that SolTrans has eliminated transfers (and replaced them with a day pass).

Stakeholder feedback on Revenue Generating Scenarios

	A. Eliminate non-mandated cash discounts/eliminate proxies for low income ✓	B. Eliminate discounted fare products (e.g., monthly passes)	C. Implement fare increases for non-low income riders ✓ (in combination with #3 above)
Study Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	Low	N/A	Low
Partnership Transit Finance Working Group (TFWG)	Low	Low	Low
Policy Advisory Council Equity & Access (E&A) Subcommittee	Low	Low	Low
San Jose Focus Group with Low-Income Persons	N/A (not discussed)	N/A (not discussed)	N/A (not discussed)
Vallejo Focus Group with Low-Income Persons	N/A (not discussed)	N/A (not discussed)	N/A (not discussed)
SF/Oakland Phone Interviews with Low-Income Persons	N/A (not discussed)	N/A (not discussed)	N/A (not discussed)
Notable and/or commonly heard “pros”	None	None	None
Notable and/or commonly heard “cons”	Discounts are offered for other reasons besides being a proxy for low income (honoring elders, etc.) (TFWG); Bus operators have few higher income riders, so there are not very many people that you could raise fares on (TAC, E&A); Wrong approach to penalize riders (TFWG, focus groups, E&A)	Might reduce incentive to ride transit (E&A); Wrong approach to penalize riders (TFWG, focus groups, E&A)	Bus operators have few higher income riders, so there are not very many people that you could raise fares on (TAC, E&A); Wrong approach to penalize riders (TFWG, focus groups, E&A)

Feedback on scenarios in general and on scenario implementation

The following were commonly heard comments regarding the scenarios *in general*:

- Simplicity and ability to communicate easily are very important.
- Anything on Clipper will rely heavily on low income residents’ ease of obtaining and reloading Clipper cards (note that at focus groups, particularly in San Jose, few of the focus group participants knew where/how to obtain and replenish Clipper cards).
- The Regional Transit Connection (RTC) Discount ID Card, which is currently available to persons with qualifying disabilities, is a potential model for a regional discount card system that works well (note that other stakeholders felt the RTC model itself needed improvements).

The following were commonly heard and/or notable comments regarding scenario *implementation*:

- Operators do not want to be responsible for means-testing.
- The income threshold needs to take into account the high cost of living in the Bay Area.
- Likely that target population is not receiving any other benefit programs (e.g., CalFresh, MediCal).
- Several focus group participants *were* familiar with the PG&E CARE program, which could be used to determine eligibility, although not all would be able to use that as their own proof of eligibility.
- There need to be multiple options for proving income eligibility.
- If a scenario is selected that has an income threshold, there needs to be consideration of the riders who may be above the threshold but still low income.
- Obtaining and replenishing Clipper cards needs to be made much easier. Suggestions for Clipper card distribution included kiosks at libraries and high schools, a rolling van that travels to events in low-income communities.
- Lots of questions/confusion about how the discount would work with other discounts (e.g., senior, disabled, youth).
- Low income people frequently wish that they could buy a “family pass” (potentially something to consider when considering how discounts for youth are coordinated with the low income discount).
- Bus riders are very often low-income, therefore means-testing is not really necessary for that mode.